



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

42
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/925,946	08/09/2001	Wayne C. Horn	2090.304	6903
22853	7590	09/21/2004	EXAMINER	
LEVIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP 384 FORESET AVE, SUITE 13 LAGUNA BEACH, CA 92651				NGUYEN, NAM V
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2635

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/925,946	HOM, WAYNE C.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Nam V Nguyen	2635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 August 2001.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 09 August 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The application of Hom for a “method and apparatus for updating security control system operating parameters” filed August 9, 2001 has been examined.

Claims 1-24 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure form (PTO-1449) listing the references was not enclosed in the application.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 2 line 8, “the an” should be “to an”.

On page 2 line 9, “bre” should be deleted.

On page 3 line 18, “mechani9sm” should be “mechanism”.

On page 4 line 14, “he” should be “the”.

On page 4 line 22, “I the form of a name” should be removed or corrected.

On page 7 line 4, “th3e” should be “the”.

On page 8 line 7, “3.g.” should be “i.g.”.

An appropriate correction is required.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The current abstract using more than 150 words is implied and should be avoided. See MPEP 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 1 and 21, the phrase "providing the control system with a first map to the memory" is confusing and unclear. It is not understood what is meant by such a limitation. Is the control system referring to the control system 10 or a controller 12 (see Specification page 3 lines 15 to 20; see Figure 1).

In claims 1 and 21, the phrase “storage means for storing ...in a plurality of first data locations within the memory” is confusing and unclear. It is not understood what is meant by such a limitation. Is the storage means same as the memory and data locations? What is the different between storage means, first/second/third data locations, and the memory?

In claims 1 and 21, the phrase “an apparatus for updating the operating parameters for a security gate having a control system comprising a memory” is confusing and unclear. It is not understood what is meant by such a limitation. What is the apparatus that trying to claim? Is an apparatus referring to a memory, a controller, a control system or locations within the memory?

Referring to claims 2-20 and 22-24 are rejected as being dependent upon rejected claims 1 and 21 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-16 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anthonyson (US# 5,737,710) and in view of Garnett (US# 5,911,778).

Referring to claims 1 and 21, Anthonyson discloses an apparatus (212) (i.e. a database) and method for updating the operating parameters (i.e. a rate calculation, rate definition, accounts receivable, reports, and etc.) for a security gate (146) (i.e. a gate) having a control system (100) (i.e. a satellite parking facility) comprising a memory (212) (column 2 lines 37 to 65; see Figures 1-2), comprising:

Storage means (212) (i.e. a data storage) for storing a first plurality of operating parameters (i.e. recognized tags) in a plurality of first data locations (228) (i.e. a parking administration module) within the memory (213) (i.e. a database) (column 6 lines 31 to 61; see Figure 2),

A control system (216) (i.e. a communication board) having a first mapping means (i.e. a connection between a parking administration and communication board) for indicating the respective first data location (228) for each of the respective plurality of operating parameters (i.e. recognized tags) within the memory (213) (column 6 lines 31 to 61; column 7 lines 14 to 25; see Figure 2);

Storage means (212) for storing a plurality of operating parameters (i.e. a customer maintenance and reports) into a plurality of second data locations (224/226) (i.e. customer maintenance/reports) within the memory (213) (i.e. a database), the plurality of second data locations (224/226) not including any of the plurality of first data locations (228) (column 7 lines 37 to 44; see Figure 2);

The control system (216) having a second mapping means (i.e. a connection between a parking administration and communication board) for indicating the respective second data

location (224/226) for each of the respective plurality of operating parameters (column 7 lines 37 to 44; see Figure 2);

Storage means (212) for storing a plurality of operating parameters (accounts receivables, rates, and etc.) into a plurality of third data locations (210) (i.e. account modules) within the memory (213) (i.e. a database), the plurality of third data locations (210) (i.e. an account module with sub-modules) not including any of the plurality of second data locations (224/226).

However, Anthonyson did not explicitly disclose a switching means for switching the control system from the first mapping means to the second mapping means and from the second mapping means to the third mapping means;

In the same field of endeavor of controlling and processing access security system, Garnett teach that a switching means (i.e. by programming) for switching the control system (20) (i.e. a CPU) from the first mapping means (i.e. a connection between CPU 20 and memory module 32) to the second mapping means (i.e. a connection between CPU 20 and memory module 36) and from the second mapping means (i.e. a connection between CPU 20 and memory module 32) to the third mapping means (i.e. a connection between CPU 20 and memory module 38) (column 1 lines 29 to 52; column 2 lines 12 to 22; column 3 lines 30 to 56; see Figures 1-7) in order to access to the critical operational parameters of the system or to block access selectively to the storage area.

One of ordinary skilled in the art recognizes using a processor connected via a bus to a number of resources of Garnett in communication board connects to plurality of separated database modules of Anthonyson because Anthonyson suggests it is desired to provide that a

communication board connects to a parking administration sub-module and also connects to a data storage (column 6 lines 31 to column 7 lines 50; see Figure 2) and Garnett teaches that a computing system includes a processor connected via a bus to a number of resources having a plurality of memory modules (column 2 lines 12 to 22) in order to have a successful accessing to different software modules within the memory. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made using a processor connected via a bus to a number of resources of Garnett in communication board connects to plurality of separated database modules of Anthonyson with the motivation for doing so would have been to provide automated vehicle parking system to access to plurality of software modules via a communication bus within the memory directly.

Referring to claims 2 and 22, Anthonyson in view of Garnett disclose an apparatus and method of Claims 1 and 21, Garnett discloses wherein the third map and the first map are the same (i.e. connect on the same bus) for each respective one of the plurality of operating parameters (column 2 lines 12 to 22; see Figure 1).

Referring to claims 3-4 and 23-24, Anthonyson in view of Garnett disclose an apparatus and method of Claims 1 and 21, Garnett discloses wherein the set of operating parameters (i.e. critical operational parameters of the system) stored in each of the first, second and third data locations (32,36 and 38) are the same (column 1 lines 29 to 39; column 3 lines 31 to 55).

Referring to claims 5-8, Anthonyson in view of Garnett disclose an apparatus and method of Claims 1-4, Garnett discloses wherein at least one of the set of operating parameters (i.e. a rate calculation) stored in the second and third data locations (210) (i.e. an account modules) is an updated value for the respective parameter from that previously stored in the respective data location (222) (column 7 lines 26 to 36; see Figure 2).

Referring to claims 9-16, Anthonyson in view of Garnett disclose an apparatus and method of Claims 1-4, Anthonyson discloses wherein the steps of loading are carried out from a remote location (10) (i.e. a central facility computer) in communication with the control system (100) (i.e. a satellite facility) through a communication network (column 4 lines 34 to 54; see Figure 1).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 17-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable to if written to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Referring to claims 17-20, the following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art fail to suggest limitations wherein all of the operating parameters in the set of operating parameters stored in the second data locations has the same

value as was stored in the respective first data locations and the initiation of the change in the control system is in response to an indication that at least one of the values stored in a respective first data location has been corrupted.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Miyake (US# 5,563,600) discloses a data transmission for remote-controlled security system.

DeKoning et al. (US# 5,790,773) disclose a method and apparatus for generating snapshot copies for data backup in a RAID subsystem.

Ingenio et al. (US# 6,047,361) disclose a memory control device, with a common synchronous interface coupled thereto, for accessing asynchronous memory devices and different synchronous devices.

Kucharczyk et al. (US# 6,570,488) disclose a locking mechanism for use with one-time access code.

Chow et al. (US# 6,745,310) disclose a real time local and remote management of data files and directories and method of operating the same.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nam V Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3061. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Horabik can be reached on 571-272-3068. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Nam Nguyen
September 19, 2004




BRIAN ZIMMERMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER